Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application. Claims 1, 5, 10, 14, 18, and 22 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. Therefore claims 1-26 are presented for examination.

In a Final Office Action, filed February 6, 2004, claims 1-6, 10-13, and 18-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Wells et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,535,369). Applicants submit that the present claims are patentable over Wells.

Wells discloses the performance enhancement of a solid-state disk by storing repeatedly used information in a RAM. The information is referred to as FLASH array database. Further, Wells discloses that a sector header translation table (SHTT) also stored in RAM that translates a sector number into a pointer to an associated sector of data. Both the FLASH array database and SHTT must be generated during power-up because they are stored in volatile memory, RAM, and because reads and writes depend upon them. First, building begins with the initialization of the SHTT. Each pointer for each sector number is set to the same initial value. Next, the total amount of free memory within the FLASH array, and the total amount of free memory per chip are initialized to their maximum values. See Wells at col. 7, ll. 20 – col. 8, ll. 55.

Claim 1 recites storing pointers in a second memory to indicate different locations within a flash memory where data is to be stored within the flash memory. Appellants submit that there is no disclosure in Wells of storing pointers in a second memory to indicate different locations within a flash memory where data is to be stored within the flash memory. Claims 1 recites a memory and a flash memory. Thus, the memory is different memory from the flash memory. Wells discloses allocating memory for a sector of a Flash memory to be written by writing a block sector offset into a block sector

translation table of a block of Flash. See Wells at col. 18, ll. 55-59. However, allocating memory for a sector of a Flash memory to be written is not equivalent to storing pointers in a second memory to indicate different locations within a flash memory where data is to be stored within the flash memory. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Wells.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 and contain additional features, thus claims 2-4 are also patentable over Wells.

Claim 5 recites reclaiming space within a flash memory by reclaiming segments of the flash memory that include data but can be overwritten. Appellants submit that Wells does not disclose reclaiming space within a flash memory. Instead, Wells discloses a process of cleaning up a solid-state disk, where dirty sectors of the solid-state disk are converted into free memory. See Wells at col. 22, ll. 60 – col. 23, ll. 9. Cleaning up a solid-state disk is not equivalent to reclaiming space within a flash memory. Therefore, claim 5 is patentable over Wells.

Claims 6-9 depend from claim 5 and include additional features, claims 6-9 are also patentable over Wells.

Claim 10 recites an apparatus including an initialize unit coupled to a flash memory, a random access memory and a write unit to initialize the flash memory in response to receiving a request to download data by storing pointers in the random access memory to indicate the number of the blocks within the flash memory that are free to store the data. Thus, for the reasons described above with respect to claim 1, claim 10 is also patentable Wells. Since claims 11-13 depend from claim 10 and include additional features, claims 11-13 are also patentable over Wells.

Claim 14 recites a system wherein initialization includes storing pointers in a random access memory to indicate the number of the blocks within a flash memory

where data is to be stored. Thus, for the reasons described above with respect to claim 1, claim 14 is also patentable Wells. Since claims 15-17 depend from claim 14 and include additional features, claims 15-17 are also patentable over Wells.

Claim 18 recites a machine-readable medium wherein initialization includes storing pointers in a second memory to indicate different locations within the flash memory where the data is to be stored. Thus, for the reasons described above with respect to claim 1, claim 18 is also patentable Wells. Since claims 19-21 depend from claim 18 and include additional features, claims 19-21 are also patentable over Wells.

Claim 22 recites reclaiming space within a flash memory by reclaiming segments of the flash memory that include data but can be overwritten, and storing pointers in a second memory to the number of different locations within the flash memory to indicate where free space is located within the flash memory. Thus, for the reasons described above with respect to claims 1 and 5, claim 22 is also patentable Wells. Since claims 23-26 depend from claim 22 and include additional features, claims 22-26 are also patentable over Wells.

Claims 7-9, 14-17, 22-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wells et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,535,369) in view of See et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,189,070). Applicants submit that the present claims are patentable over Wells even in view of See.

See discloses a method and apparatus that manages data and reads code from a nonvolatile writeable memory. See See at Abstract. Nevertheless, See does not disclose or suggest storing pointers in a second memory to indicate different locations within the flash memory where the data is to be stored within the flash memory. In addition, See does not disclose or suggest reclaiming space within the flash memory.

As discussed above, Wells also does not disclose or suggest such limitations. Therefore, any combination of Wells and See would also not disclose or suggest storing pointers in a second memory to indicate different locations within the flash memory where the data is to be stored within the flash memory, or reclaiming space within the flash memory by reclaiming segments of the flash memory that include data but can be overwritten.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome, and that the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: July 2, 2004

Mark L. Watson
Reg. No. 46,322

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(303) 740-1980